

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 9 are presently pending in the application. Claim 5 has been amended to more clearly set forth the claimed invention. Claim 9 has amended to correct a typographical error.

In paragraph 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 5 - 7 were rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. More specifically, it was alleged in the Office Action that the specification did not provide enablement for "currently reading out data being currently written in the memory from the microprocessor (See Claim 5, lines 15 - 17)", because, the claimed "microprocessor" did not have a memory for storing data. Claims 6 and 7 were rejected as depending from rejected claim 5. Claim 5 has been amended herein to make it even more clear that the data is being "read out *by* the microprocessor", rather than "*from* the microprocessor". The limitation, as amended, is supported throughout the specification of the instant application. See, for example, the instant application on page 13, lines 22 - 23. It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 8 were rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,506,747 to Bain (called "Babin" in the Office Action, hereafter referred to as "BAIN") and U. S. Patent No. 5,841,722 to Willenz ("WILLENZ").

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claims 3, 4 and 9 were rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over AAPA in view of BAIN and WILLENZ, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,673,416 to Chee ("CHEE").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections.

- I. Applicant's claims require, among other limitations, a memory having a settable size, which size is set dynamically, in accordance with a size of contemporaneously transmitted data.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Applicant's claims require, among other limitations, a memory having a settable size. Applicant's claim 1 recites, among other limitations:

"writing the digital data of a given HDLC-data frame from the first data bus to a memory having a settable size, said memory being arranged directly between said

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

first data bus and said second data bus;" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant's independent claim 3 recites, among other limitations:

"writing the digital data from the first data bus to a memory having a **settable size**, said memory being arranged directly between said first data bus and said second data bus;" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant's claim 5 recites, among other limitations:

"a memory having a **settable size** for storing data received from the first data bus and for subsequently reading out by the microprocessor,"

Further, the "**settable size**" of Applicant's claimed memory is determined dynamically, based on the size of the transmitted data to be written contemporaneously to the memory. For example, Applicant's claim 1 recites, among other limitations:

"**setting dynamically via the microprocessor a size of the memory for a current reading/writing procedure of said memory;**" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant's independent claim 3 recites, among other limitations:

"**setting dynamically via the microprocessor a size of the memory for a following reading/writing procedure of said memory, the settable size being dependent on the size of said transmitted HDLC-data frame being written at the same time in said memory;**" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

Applicant's independent claim 5 recites, among other limitations:

"the settable size being dependent on the size of said transmitted HDLC-data frame being written at the same time in said memory;" [emphasis added by Applicant]

Both, 1) Applicant's memory having a settable size; and 2) the size being set, dynamically in accordance with a size of contemporaneously transmitted data, need to be found in the references in order to render Applicant's claims unpatentable. However, the references presently cited in the Office Action, neither teach, nor suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, the two above-cited limitations.

II. The AAPA, BAIN, WILLENZ and CHEE references fail to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, a memory having a settable size, which size is set dynamically, in accordance with a size of contemporaneously transmitted data.

As described in section I, above, both, 1) Applicant's memory having a settable size; and 2) the size being set, dynamically in accordance with a size of contemporaneously transmitted data, need to be found in the references in order to render Applicant's claims unpatentable. However, the references presently cited in the Office Action, neither teach, nor suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, the two above-cited limitations.

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

More particularly, the AAPA cited in the specification of the instant application, as noted in the Office Action on page 4, line 12, fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, a **settable memory**. More particularly, on page 4 of the Office Action, it was stated:

"AAPA does not teach said memory being arranged directly between said first data bus and said second data bus, and having a **settable size**; and determining via said microprocessor from said memory control unit a quantity of said digital data to be read from said memory." [emphasis added by Applicant]

In failing to teach a memory having a **settable size**, the AAPA not only fails to teach Applicant's particularly claimed memory (point 1, above), but in so lacking such a teaching, cannot even be found to suggest Applicant's claimed invention where the size of the memory is dynamically set in accordance with contemporaneously sent data (point 2, above). As such, the AAPA reference fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's claimed invention, and Applicant's claims are patentable over the AAPA reference.

In addition to the above elements of Applicant's claims missing from the AAPA, the AAPA additionally fails to teach or suggest other elements of Applicant's claimed invention, such as the "informing" step of claim 1 and the reading of data, via the microprocessor. With regard to the reading of data of Applicant's claim 1, the AAPA only discloses a "removal" of

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

the data stored in the memory. However, the process of removal is neither identical to, nor equivalent to the process of reading. In fact, the process of removal is rather identical to the process of writing since the removal means that the respective memory portions are being written with a predefined logical value (i.e. "0") or an undefined state (i.e. "floating"). In the removal process of the AAPA, the data to be removed from the memory are never read out before. In summary, since the process of removal is not the same as the process of reading, as required by Applicant's claim 1, this feature is not disclosed in the AAPA. Nor does the AAPA perform Applicant's informing step of claim 1. The AAPA merely discloses that a microprocessor is informed if the received D-channel signals contain a byte indicating a frame end. This does not imply in the AAPA that the D-channel signals are stored in the memory in a way that the memory contains an entry indicating an end of a data frame.

Further, the BAIN reference cited in the Office Action, also fails to teach or suggest Applicant's particularly claimed memory having a settable size, and thus also cannot possibly teach or suggest that Applicant's particularly claimed dynamic setting of the memory size in accordance with a size of contemporaneously sent data. More particularly, the BAIN reference relates to provision of FIFO buffer in RAM. Rather

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

than resizing a memory, as required by Applicant's claims, BAIN teaches providing FIFOs having "various depths" in a RAM in a plurality of groups. See the BAIN Abstract. See also, Col. 2 of BAIN, lines 16 - 18, which states:

"The addressing arrangement of the invention enables many FIFOs of various sizes or depths to be provided in a RAM, with very little storage requirement."
[emphasis added by Applicant]

Having a plurality of FIFOs of different sizes in a RAM, is not the same as dynamically sizing a memory in accordance with contemporaneously transmitted data, as is required by Applicant's claims. The size of the FIFOs in BAIN are preset, and the RAM is pre-informed of the "depth" of each FIFO. See, BAIN col. 2, lines 25 - 41. In BAIN, the memory size is not set dynamically, as required by Applicant's claims. This is supported in the Office Action, on page 5, lines 1 - 2, which state:

"AAPA, as modified by Babin [sic] does not teach setting dynamically via said microprocessor a size of said memory for a current reading/writing procedure of said memory."

The BAIN reference, like the AAPA fails to teach or suggest Applicant's limitations 1) and 2) above, among others. As such, the BAIN reference cannot be used to cure the deficiencies of the cited AAPA reference.

Applic. No. 09/398,689
Response Dated January 31, 2005
Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

Nor does the WILLENZ reference cited in the Office Action, teach or suggest Applicant's particularly claimed memory having a settable size. On page 5 of the Office Action, lines 3 - 6, states:

"Willenz discloses a variable sized FIFO buffer (See Fig. 1 and Abstract), wherein setting dynamically via a microprocessor (i.e., controller 16 of Figs. 1 and 2) a size of a memory (i.e., a variable size of FIFO buffer, viz., upper FIFO 10, lower FIFO, 12 and Random Access Memory 14 in Fig. 1, for a current reading/writing procedure of said memory (See col. 1, lines 26 - 29)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the above statement of what is allegedly taught by WILLENZ. Although WILLENZ states that it discloses a "variable sized" FIFO, it is not truly a "memory having a settable size" as claimed by Applicant. Rather, the WILLENZ reference discloses a FIFO including an upper FIFO buffer of a fixed size, a lower FIFO buffer of a fixed size, and a RAM. The RAM is utilized only when data can no longer flow between the upper and lower FIFO buffers, due to the lower FIFO buffer being temporarily full. See, the Abstract; col. 1, lines 36 - 50. The problem resulting from the arrangement taught in the WILLENZ reference is avoided by Applicant's claimed invention. In WILLENZ the upper and lower FIFO buffer may be temporarily full, since they are of fixed size. In WILLENZ, when one of the FIFO buffers is temporarily full, the data is latched into the RAM. Thus, the RAM is working as an additional buffer unit. However, neither the

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

upper FIFO buffer, nor the lower FIFO buffer, nor the RAM of WILLENZ have a settable size, as required by Applicant's claims. As such, the WILLENZ reference fails to teach a memory "having a settable size", as required by Applicant's claims.

Further, WILLENZ fails to teach or suggest that its so-called "variable-size" FIFO arrangement (the fixed size upper and lower FIFOs and RAM) has a size that is being dynamically set contemporaneously in accordance with the size of the data. Rather, col. 1 of WILLENZ, lines 26 - 28, states:

"There is therefore provided, in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention, a variable sized FIFO buffer whose size changes in accordance with how much data is present to be passed between the two systems."

The above is accomplished in WILLENZ, as stated in col. 3, lines 16 - 34, which states:

"When the lower FIFO 12 reaches a full state (i.e. the indication from the lower flag unit 32 changes from a non-full indication to a full indication), control unit 44 indicates to the block combiner 46 to begin collecting the data flowing from the upper FIFO 10 into blocks. Typically, a block is eight words although other sized blocks can also be utilized. The size of the block is a function of the speed of the RAM 14. If, after the block has been created, the lower flag unit 32 still indicates fullness, the control unit 44 will initiate the writing of the block from block combiner 46 into RAM 14. This involves incrementing the write counter 38 to indicate the new address at which to write into the RAM 14, indicating to address MUX 42 to provide the output of the write counter 38 to the RAM

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

14 and providing a write (WR) signal to the RAM 14 (so that the RAM will perform the write operation).

Since RAM 14 acts as a first-in, first-out buffer, albeit with a single shared port, the blocks of words are sequentially written to it and are sequentially read out from it."

WILLENZ fails to teach or suggest a memory having a **settable size**, and **dynamically changing the size of a settable memory**

during the data communication (see claim 1 "for a current reading/writing procedure"; and claims 3 and 5 "written at the same time"), as claimed by Applicant.

Additionally, the **CHEE** reference was cited in the Office Action on page 7, last paragraph, as allegedly disclosing a memory request and control unit. Even if, arguendo, **CHEE** were to teach the things alleged in the Office Action, **CHEE** neither teaches, nor suggests, a memory having a **settable size**, the size of which is set **dynamically** in accordance with **contemporaneously** transmitted data. As such, the **CHEE** reference cannot supply the missing elements that are neither taught, nor suggested, in the **AAPA**, **BAIN** and **WILLENZ** references.

III. Conclusion.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

the features of claims 1, 3 or 5. Claims 1, 3 and 5 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 3 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of
claims 1 - 9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one month extension of time, to and including, January 29, 2005, to respond to the present Office Action.

The extension fee for response within a period of one (1) month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004


respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of
Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Applic. No. 09/398,689

Response Dated January 31, 2005

Responsive to Office Action of September 29, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman

Reg. No. 37,237

KPS:cgm

January 31, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.

Post Office Box 2480

Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

Tel: (954) 925-1100

Fax: (954) 925-1101